

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/037,485	MASTROMATTEO, UBALDO	

All Participants: _____ **Status of Application:** _____

(1) Hung K. Vu. (3) _____.

(2) Harold H. Bennett II. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2004 **Time:** 3:00

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-12, 30-40

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See *Continuation Sheet*

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner points out that claim 1 recites the limitations of semiconductor regions and isolation regions in a first wafer of semiconductor material. However, Figure 11 and the related description of page 9 of the specification show semiconductor regions (56) and isolation regions (55) on, not in, a first wafer (54) of semiconductor material. Therefore, claim 1 is not read on the elected embodiment of Figure 11. Attorney Bennett argues that because Examiner issued the Ex Parte Quayle action, he did not have opportunity to respond..